



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,695	06/13/2000	Andrea G Cochran	P1762R1	7146

7590                    02/20/2002

Steven X Cui  
Genentech INC  
1 DNA Way  
South San Francisco, CA 94080-4990

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TIZIO, STEVEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1627	

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/592,695	COCHRAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Steven C Tizio	<b>Art Unit</b> 1627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/15/02.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

- 8) Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### Please note the change in examiner

***Please note:*** In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1627 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is **(703) 305-3704**. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this pilot program. If you have any questions or suggestions please contact Jyothnsa Venkat, Ph.D., Supervisory Examiner, at [Jyothsna.Venkat@uspto.gov](mailto:Jyothsna.Venkat@uspto.gov) or 703-308-2439. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-15, drawn to a library of structurally-constrained peptides comprising a plurality of cyclic peptides, classified in class 530, subclass 317 and class 435, subclass DIG 35.
  - II. Claim 16, drawn to a method of screening for peptides having a β-hairpin scaffold, classified in class 435, subclass 4 and DIG 15.
  - III. Claims 17-18, drawn to a method of identifying a peptide capable of binding to a specific binding protein, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. **Groups I-III** represent separate and distinct inventions. **Group I** (library of peptides) is drawn to a product and **Groups II and III** are drawn to different methods (method of screening for peptides and method of identifying peptides) (i.e., e.g., which are directed to different purposes, use different materials, recite different method or process steps for the preparation of different product(s), screening of different characteristics, such as different binding affinities, different biochemical reaction conditions, etc. or lead to different final results). Therefore, the groups that describe these products and methods have different issues regarding patentability and enablement, and represent patentably distinct subject matter, which merits separate and burdensome searches. Art anticipating or rendering obvious each of the above-identified groups respectively would not necessarily anticipate or render obvious another group, because they are drawn to different inventions that have different distinguishing features and/or characteristics. Each group will support separate patents.

4. **Groups II and III** are related to different methods (i.e., e.g., which have different functions, uses, starting materials, and produce different results) and thus represent separate and distinct inventions. The invention of **Group II** relates to a method of screening for peptides having a  $\beta$ -hairpin scaffold that is conformationally stabilized, which utilizes a thermodynamic approach. The invention of **Group III** relates to a

Art Unit: 1627

method of identifying a peptide capable of binding to a specific binding partner, which utilizes the noncovalent binding of peptides to a binding partner. The different methods of **Groups II and III** do not require each other. The results of the methods are different and the method steps are different. Thus restriction between the groups is proper.

5. Inventions of **Group I** and of **Group II and III** are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the peptide library of **Group I** can be used in the screening method of **Group II** or the identification method of **Group III**. The product can thus be used in two different processes. Thus restriction between the groups is proper.

6. These inventions are distinct for the reasons above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and/or shown by their different classifications. While some of the aforementioned groups are classified under an identical class/sub-class, the corresponding non-patent literature search remains unaffected. Each of the identified groups may require different searches. For example, methods and products groups require different searches. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

### **Election of Species**

7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A) If **Group I** is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species of the following:

- 1) elect a single amino acid species of A1.
- 2) elect a single amino acid species of A2.
- 3) elect a single amino acid species of A3.
- 4) elect a single amino acid species of A4.
- 5) elect a single amino acid species of A5.
- 6) elect a value of the integer n.
- 7) if n=4, applicant is further requested to elect a single species of  $(A3)_4$  (i.e. EGNK) in claim 11.

8. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-10 and 12-18 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

Art Unit: 1627

11. Applicant is required to reply to the restriction requirement within 30 days of mailing this action. See MPEP 809.2(a).

### **Conclusion**

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Tizio whose telephone number is (703) 305-1903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jyothsna Venkat, can be reached at (703) 308-2439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Steven C. Tizio

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

AU 1627

  
**PADMASHRI PONNALURI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**